

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	D	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/675,692		09/29/2000	Ashraf A. Michail	MS1-676US	1488	
22801	7590	12/06/2004		EXAMINER		
LEE & H			CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D			
SPOKAN		E AVENUE SUITE 99201	2 300	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
<i>5. 5</i>				2179		
				DATE MAILED: 12/06/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/675,692	MICHAIL ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joshua D Campbell	2179	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 12 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appli ) a timely filed amendment wh al (with appeal fee); or (3) a tim	cation. A proper repich places the application.	ply to a cation in
	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adviewent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later that ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS I 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sory Action, or (2) the date set forth in than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection.  E FINAL REJECTION. Solution  136(a) and the appropriate existence the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.192(a)).	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further		(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	• •		
<ul><li>(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	separate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NO	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:	-		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approximately approximate	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen  10. Other:	fall HEAT	HER R. HERNDON ORY PATENT EXAMINES OLOGY CENTER 2100	1

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As stated in the previous rejection Prinzing discloses that formatting can be applied based on an extension of an editor, including changing color, which by definition is highlighting regardless of whether the word highlight is used or not. Prinzing is used in combination with Neibauer because Neibauer teaches the functionality and abilities that are known to be attached with highlighting tools. Prinzing teaches that functionality can be added to the editor modularly without rewriting the editor which is the basis for the rejection and motivation. Also, as stated in the previous rejection, attacking the references individually will not sjow nonobviousness because the rejections are based on combinations of references.